



Effective Theories of Dark Matter

Tim M.P. Tait

University of California, Irvine



SUSY 2011
August 31

References

This talk is based on:

Beltran, Hooper, Kolb, Krusberg, TMPT 1002.4137;
Goodman, Ibe, Rajaraman, Shepherd, TMPT, Yu
1005.1286, 1008.1783 & 1009.0008;
Fortin, TMPT 1103.3289;
Rajaraman, Shepherd, TMPT, Wijanco 1108.1196.






Related work by the FNAL clan (with talks earlier this week by Roni and Yuhsin):

Bai, Fox, Harnik 1005.3797
Fox, Harnik, Kopp, Tsai 1103.0240 & coming soon

Outline


- Motivation: “Generic descriptions” of WIMP-Standard Model Interactions
- Interplay between Experimental Searches
 - Effective Theory Description of Dark Matter Interactions
 - The Impact of Collider Searches on Direct Detection
 - Fermi Line Search
- Outlook

WIMP Searches





WIMPs interacting with SM particles allow indirect searches for annihilation products, direct scattering searches, and production at colliders.

Direct Detection Results




Other Experiments?

- Direct detection probes WIMP couplings to nucleons (quarks and gluons).
- This raises an important question:
 - **Why are there no bounds from colliders on this plot?**
- E.g. High energy accelerators such as the Tevatron and LHC collide (anti-) protons.
- There *must* be some interplay between the two: if WIMPs couple to nucleons, we can produce them in high energy collisions of hadrons.





MSSM




Beyond Supersymmetry

- The main reason why collider searches don't show up on this plot is that one needs to make additional assumptions to put them there.
- The *usual* way to search for WIMPs at colliders is to produce some of the other particles in the dark matter theory, and then watch them decay into WIMPs (as well as SM particles).
- This process is intrinsically model-dependent.
- Without knowing the details of these extra particles, we can't even predict what the collider is supposed to be looking for, let alone the expected rate and how it correlates with a direct detection signal.



Maverick WIMPs

- Producing the WIMP's siblings is always model-dependent. But we can look at production directly from the WIMP couplings to quarks and gluons.
- This process may result in less spectacular signals than producing other particles in the theory. But it is generic, relying only on the existence of the WIMP itself.
- Since in this process the WIMP appears alone, without any of the other particles of the dark matter theory, I'll refer to it as a "Maverick WIMP".




Effective Field Theory

- I cheated slightly: the WIMP siblings are still part of this process, albeit virtually.

- We bypass this issue by using writing interactions in terms of **Effective Field Theories** which describe physics in terms of the degrees of freedom relevant at the energy scale of interest. Heavier particles are “integrated out”.

- Theories which are different at high energies lead to a small range of low energy phenomena, because their form is dictated by the particles and symmetries present at low energies.

- Capitalizing on these strengths, we construct general EFTs describing WIMP interactions.



Example EFT: Majorana WIMP

As an example, we can write down operators of interest for a Majorana WIMP.

There are 10 leading operators consistent with Lorentz and $SU(3) \times U(1)_{\text{EM}}$ gauge invariance coupling the WIMP to quarks and gluons.

Gluon operators are normalized by α_s , consistent with their having been induced by loops of some heavy colored state.

Each operator has a (separate) coefficient M_* which parametrizes its strength.

Name	Type	G_χ	Γ^χ	Γ^q
M1	qq	$m_q/2M_*^3$	1	1
M2	qq	$im_q/2M_*^3$	γ_5	1
M3	qq	$im_q/2M_*^3$	1	γ_5
M4	qq	$m_q/2M_*^3$	γ_5	γ_5
M5	qq	$1/2M_*^2$	$\gamma_5 \gamma_\mu$	γ^μ
M6	qq	$1/2M_*^2$	$\gamma_5 \gamma_\mu$	$\gamma_5 \gamma^\mu$
M7	GG	$\alpha_s/8M_*^3$	1	-
M8	GG	$i\alpha_s/8M_*^3$	γ_5	-
M9	$G\tilde{G}$	$\alpha_s/8M_*^3$	1	-
M10	$G\tilde{G}$	$i\alpha_s/8M_*^3$	γ_5	-

$$\sum_q G_\chi [\bar{\chi} \Gamma^\chi \chi] G^2 [\bar{q} \Gamma^q q] [\bar{\chi} \Gamma^\chi \chi]$$

Other operators may be rewritten in this form by using Fierz transformations.

Jets + MET



- CDF has a monojet search aimed at ADD large extra dimensions, where the jet is recoiling against one of a tower of KK gravitons.

- Event Selection:

- Leading jet $PT > 80$ GeV.


- Missing ET > 80 GeV.

- 2nd jet allowed $PT < 30$ GeV.

- Veto more jets $PT > 20$ GeV.

- Veto isolated leptons with $PT > 10$ GeV.

- Based on 1 fb^{-1} , CDF constrains new physics (after cuts) contributions to $\sigma < 0.6 \text{ pb}$.



CDF, 0807.3132

http://www-cdf.fnal.gov/physics/exotica/r2a/20070322.mono_jet/public/ykk.html

Backgrounds

- To calibrate our simulations, we reproduce the CDF background using MadEvent with PYTHIA and PGS [CDF detector Model].

Beltran, Hooper, Kolb, Krusberg, TMPT,
JHEP 1009:037 (2010)

- Including NLO k-factors, we succeeded at the % level.


- The dominant physics backgrounds are:

- Z + jets (with $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu$).

- W + jets ($W \rightarrow e\nu$ with the e lost).


- The “QCD” background from jet mismeasurements creating fake missing energy is subdominant, as determined by CDF itself.

- (And we don't try to simulate it).



Signal and Background

- At the parton level, there is a clear difference between the kinematics of the WIMP events compared with the SM backgrounds.
- The WIMPs are produced by higher dimensional operators, which grow with energy compared to the softer SM background processes.
- The harder spectrum is reflected in the PT of the associated jet(s), which must balance the WIMPs.






$$M6: [\bar{\chi}\gamma^{\mu}\gamma_5\chi] [\bar{q}\gamma_{\mu}\gamma_5q]$$

Beyond the Parton Level


These differences survive parton showering and hadronization and simulated detector response.

Our detailed study suggests that one can probably optimize a search that does better than the monojet search aimed at ADD, but the existing search is performing reasonably well already.


Beltran, Hooper, Kolb, Krusberg, TMPT,
JHEP 1009:037 (2010)



Example of Limits/Sensitivity



Example Limits/Sensitivity




Axial-vector Coupling

- These operators were particularly amenable to collider searches.
- They both lead to velocity suppressed WIMP annihilation cross sections.
- The relic density requires that they have somewhat strong coefficients to over-come the velocity suppression.
- The collider signal produces the WIMPs relativistically, with no velocity suppression.
- It's worth reminding ourselves that nothing tells us the annihilation cross section (and thus the relic density) needs to be mediated by this particular interaction.

Name	Type	G_χ	Γ^x	Γ^q
M1	qq	$m_q/2M_*^3$	1	1
M2	qq	$im_q/2M_*^3$	γ_5	1
M3	qq	$im_q/2M_*^3$	1	γ_5
M4	qq	$m_q/2M_*^3$	γ_5	γ_5
M5	qq	$1/2M_*^2$	$\gamma_5\gamma_\mu$	γ^μ
M6	qq	$1/2M_*^2$	$\gamma_5\gamma_\mu$	$\gamma_5\gamma^\mu$
M7	GG	$\alpha_s/8M_*^3$	1	-
M8	GG	$i\alpha_s/8M_*^3$	γ_5	-
M9	$G\tilde{G}$	$\alpha_s/8M_*^3$	1	-
M10	$G\tilde{G}$	$i\alpha_s/8M_*^3$	γ_5	-

We can make similar plots for any combination of WIMP spin and operator. (And we did in 1008.1783)


Spin-Independent



Similar results from the FNAL group: Bai, Fox, Harnik 1005.3797 [JHEP]!

SI: Zoomed Out

Goodman, Ibe, Rajaraman, Shepherd, TMPT, Yu
PLB 695, 185 (2011)



Mack, Beacom, Bertone, 0705.4298

Earth heating exclusion

Earth screens conventional
direct detection

$\bar{\chi}\chi\bar{q}q$ exclusion

$\bar{\chi}\gamma^{\mu}\gamma^5\chi\bar{q}\gamma^{\mu}\gamma^5q$ exclusion


$\bar{\chi}\chi G^2$ exclusion

Tevatron

(cartoon of)
Direct detection exclusion


ATLAS Bounds: SI

Equal u- and d- couplings




ATLAS Bounds: SD

Equal u- and d- couplings



Iso-spin Violating




For up- and down-quark couplings adjusted such that $f_n \sim -0.7 f_p$, constraints from Xenon are much weaker than the CoGeNT signal.

Naive MFV implementations are ruled out by colliders, but specific non-MFV constructions survive.


Feng, Kumar, Marfatia, Sanford 1102.4331 (see also: Chang, Pierce, Weiner 1004.0697)

UV Thoughts

- When the mediators are directly accessible to the collider, our conclusions become suspect.
- This is most worrisome at colliders.
- How this effects bounds depends a lot on the nature of the UV completion.
- Light-mediator completions have much weaker bounds.
- “SUSY-like” completions often have stronger bounds.




Bai, Fox, Harnik [1005.3797]




UV Thoughts

- When the mediators are directly accessible to the collider, our conclusions become suspect.
- This is most worrisome at colliders.
- How this effects bounds depends a lot on the nature of the UV completion.
- Light-mediator completions have much weaker bounds.
- “SUSY-like” completions often have stronger bounds.






Bai, Fox, Harnik [1005.3797]




Line Limits from Fermi

- If we close our operators into a loop and attach photons, we have a process where two WIMPs annihilate producing mono-energetic gamma rays.
- We can learn about our operators from the Fermi (null) line search.
- Bounds depend on the galactic distribution of dark matter.






Spin-dependent

Dirac Fermion WIMP



Line Cross Section




For LEP constraints, see: Fox, Harnik, Kopp, Tsai 1103.0240; Fortin, TMPT 1002.3289

Outlook


- Effective theories provide a model-independent language to describe the interactions of WIMPs with the Standard Model.
- They provide a framework with which it makes sense to compare different kinds of experiments together.
- They can only accurately capture theories whose mediating particles are somewhat heavier than the energies of interest.
- There is lots of potential for interplay between collider, direct, and indirect detection.
- Effective theory pinpoints how they can work together to produce a picture which is far greater than each individual part!

Bonus Material

Direct Detection





- The basic strategy of direct detection is to look for the low energy recoil of a heavy nucleus when a WIMP brushes against it.
- Direct detection looks for the dark matter in our galaxy's halo, and a positive signal would be a direct observation.
- Heavy shielding and secondary characteristics of the interaction, such as scintillation light or timing help filter out backgrounds.
- These searches are rapidly advancing, with orders of magnitude improvements in sensitivity expected to take place within the next few years!



Collider to Direct Searches

- Since our effective theory describes precisely the interactions of WIMPs with quarks and gluons, we can translate our collider bounds into the direct detection plane.
- There are two distinct classes of direct detection searches to compare with:
 - Spin-independent (SI) scattering looks for direct scattering of the WIMP from the nucleons in the nucleus.
 - Spin-dependent (SD) scattering looks for interactions coupling the WIMP's spin to the nuclear spin.



An EFT for Dark Matter

- To construct an effective theory description of a WIMP:
 - We start with the Standard Model.
 - We add a dark matter particle, choosing a spin and electroweak representation.
 - (For simplicity, we start by choosing a gauge singlet with no direct electroweak interactions).
 - We add interactions with quarks and gluons, consistent with the exact symmetries of the SM: Lorentz and $SU(3) \times U(1)_{\text{EM}}$ gauge invariance.
 - To simplify things, we group quark operators together in a way which minimizes constraints from flavor and CP violation.

$$\sum_q m_q \bar{q} q$$

$$\sum_q m_q \bar{q} \gamma_5 q$$

$$\sum_q \bar{q} \gamma^\mu q$$

$$\sum_q \bar{q} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 q$$

$$\sum_q \bar{q} \sigma^{\mu\nu} q$$

Dirac WIMPs

- We can repeat this exercise for other choices of WIMP spin.

- For a Dirac WIMP, we have a few more Lorentz structures, such as the vector and tensor combinations.

- On top of the operators we had for the Majorana WIMP, magnetic and electric dipole moment operators are possible as well.

- For a Dirac WIMP, we assume (where it matters) that the galactic halo is equal numbers of WIMPs and anti-WIMPs.

“Asymmetric” dark matter would also be interesting!

Name	Operator	Coefficient
D1	$\bar{\chi}\chi\bar{q}q$	m_q/M_*^3
D2	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi\bar{q}q$	im_q/M_*^3
D3	$\bar{\chi}\chi\bar{q}\gamma^5q$	im_q/M_*^3
D4	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi\bar{q}\gamma^5q$	m_q/M_*^3
D5	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu\chi\bar{q}\gamma_\mu q$	$1/M_*^2$
D6	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5\chi\bar{q}\gamma_\mu q$	$1/M_*^2$
D7	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu\chi\bar{q}\gamma_\mu\gamma^5q$	$1/M_*^2$
D8	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5\chi\bar{q}\gamma_\mu\gamma^5q$	$1/M_*^2$
D9	$\bar{\chi}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\chi\bar{q}\sigma_{\mu\nu}q$	$1/M_*^2$
D10	$\bar{\chi}\sigma_{\mu\nu}\gamma^5\chi\bar{q}\sigma_{\mu\nu}q$	i/M_*^2
D11	$\bar{\chi}\chi G_{\mu\nu}G^{\mu\nu}$	$\alpha_s/4M_*^3$
D12	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi G_{\mu\nu}G^{\mu\nu}$	$i\alpha_s/4M_*^3$
D13	$\bar{\chi}\chi G_{\mu\nu}\tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}$	$i\alpha_s/4M_*^3$
D14	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi G_{\mu\nu}\tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}$	$\alpha_s/4M_*^3$
D15	$\bar{\chi}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\chi F_{\mu\nu}$	M
D16	$\bar{\chi}\sigma_{\mu\nu}\gamma^5\chi F_{\mu\nu}$	D

Spin Zero WIMPs


- We can play the same game with scalar WIMPs, both real (R) and complex (C).
- Vector interactions of a real WIMP can be rewritten using the equations of motion in terms of scalar operators.
- As with the Dirac WIMPs, we assume a complex scalar WIMP is not asymmetric -- the dark matter of the Universe is composed of equal amounts WIMPs and anti-WIMPs.

R1	$\chi^2 \bar{q} q$	$m_q/2M_*^2$
R2	$\chi^2 \bar{q} \gamma^5 q$	$im_q/2M_*^2$
R3	$\chi^2 G_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}$	$\alpha_s/8M_*^2$
R4	$\chi^2 G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}$	$i\alpha_s/8M_*^2$

C1	$\chi^\dagger \chi \bar{q} q$	m_q/M_*^2
C2	$\chi^\dagger \chi \bar{q} \gamma^5 q$	im_q/M_*^2
C3	$\chi^\dagger \partial_\mu \chi \bar{q} \gamma^\mu q$	$1/M_*^2$
C4	$\chi^\dagger \partial_\mu \chi \bar{q} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 q$	$1/M_*^2$
C5	$\chi^\dagger \chi G_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}$	$\alpha_s/4M_*^2$
C6	$\chi^\dagger \chi G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}$	$i\alpha_s/4M_*^2$

Limits of Effective Theory

- Effective theories describe the leading term in the low energy expansion of the full theory.
- That's why many different high energy theories lead to the same effective theory description.
- As we approach energy transfers comparable to the mass of the exchanged particle, we need to include higher terms in the series.
- At energies much higher than the mass of the exchanged particle, we can produce it directly.
- At that point, we need the complete ultraviolet theory to describe the physics.



$$\sim \frac{g^2}{p^2 - M^2}$$

$$= -\frac{g^2}{M^2} \left(1 + \frac{p^2}{M^2} + \dots \right)$$

$$\equiv G_{eff} \left(1 + \frac{p^2}{M^2} + \dots \right)$$

LHC

To estimate the LHC sensitivity we rely on the ATLAS search for jets + missing energy:

Vacavant, Hinchliffe,
J Phys G 27, 1839 (2001)

Missing $ET > 500$ GeV

Vetoing extra jets is counter-productive at the LHC.

Since we are interested in the eventual reach of the LHC, we assume 14 TeV and 100 fb⁻¹.

It would be interesting to see what the LHC can say for 7 TeV and ~ 1 fb⁻¹!

1002.4137

